



0452
373 23 609713
059 DE / 1

VALIDATION REPORT
of the
PROPOSED GENERAL GUIDELINE
"THE INTERMEDIATE YEARS"

FIELD RESPONSES

Provincial Curriculum Policy
for the
Intermediate Division

Prepared By
Curriculum Services Staff
in
Central and Regional Offices
Ministry of Education, Ontario

December, 1975

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Brief Summary of Intermediate Cyclic Review to Date
- 1.2 Validation Plan Outline
- 1.3 Organization of the Report

2. FINDINGS

Introduction

- 2.1 Occupational Classification of Sample; % Response
- 2.2 School Affiliations of Teachers, Principals and Students
- 2.3 Organizational Structures of Consultants and Supervisory Officers
- 2.4 Core Expectations vs. Core Subjects
- 2.5 Expectations for Each Year or End of Division?
- 2.6 Range of Basic Learnings
- 2.7 Statements: Suggestive or Prescriptive?
- 2.8 Personal Comfort Level with Document
- 2.9 A Bridge between "The Formative Years" and H.S.1
- 2.10 Emphasis on Literacy and Numeracy
 - (A) in Grades 7, 8; (B) in Grades 9, 10
- 2.11 Degree of Optionality
 - (A) in Grades 7, 8; (B) in Grades 9, 10
- 2.12 Student and Parental Options
 - (A) in Grades 7, 8; (B) in Grades 9, 10
- 2.13 Compatibility of Document with H.S.1
- 2.14 Provision for Exceptional Children
- 2.15 Program Elements Impaired by Document
- 2.16 From General Principles to Practice
 - (A) in Grades 7, 8; (B) in Grades 9, 10
- 2.17 Cooperative Planning by Elementary and Secondary Staffs
- 2.18 Accountability for the Expectations
- 2.19 (A) Parts of Document Requiring Expansion
 - (B) Topics Requiring Support Documents
- 2.20 Is your Input Reflected in the Document?
- 2.21 Professional Development Needs

3. FURTHER COMMENTS

3.1	Twelve Expectations	3.9	Evaluation
3.2	Support Documents	3.10	General
3.3	Options	3.11	Compatibility with H.S.1
3.4	Guidance Counselling	3.12	Local Curriculum Development
3.5	Failure	3.13	Students
3.6	Fitness	3.14	Library Resource Centres
3.7	Research	3.15	Organization Development
3.8	Special Education	3.16	Format of the Report

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5. APPENDICES

Appendix A	Copy of "The Intermediate Years"
Appendix B	Copy of the validation questionnaire
Appendix C	Provincial Summary of Statistical Data for each question, a comparison of categories (prepared by Curriculum Services Branch)
Appendix D	Comments Written on Individual Pages of the Draft Document, summarized for each page

Appendix E (in files)	Provincial Summary of Comments for each question: supportive, non-supportive, and other comments (prepared by Curriculum Services Branch)
Appendix F (in files)	Copies of Further Comments (unedited)
Appendix G (in files)	Summary of Responses for Curriculum Services Branch
Appendix H (in files)	Regional Summaries of Statistical Data for each question, a comparison of categories (prepared by regional offices)
Appendix I (in files)	Summary of Comments for each question, composite regional data by categories: supportive, non-supportive, other comments (prepared by regional offices)
Appendix J (in files)	Summary of "Further Comments" for each region (prepared by regional offices)
Appendix K (in files)	Completed Questionnaires for each region, by categories

1. INTRODUCTION

The validation of the draft of the General Guideline, The Intermediate Years (Appendix 1) was undertaken in response to instructions given at the Management Committee meeting, August 27. Since that time, the Curriculum Services Branch has planned and coordinated an extensive validation throughout the Province and prepared this Report on Validation.

1.1 Brief Summary of Intermediate Cyclic Review to Date

- . The input phase for the intermediate division began in January 1973. The Report on Input submitted in September, 1973 was the culmination of the input phase that ended in March, 1973 under the chairmanship of Dr. Gordon Bergman.
- . The second phase was conducted by a combined team from the Curriculum Development and Curriculum Services Branches, chaired by Lloyd Thompson. The report, Issues and Alternatives for the Intermediate Division was finalized on November 25, 1974.
- . The third stage also involved a committee from both curriculum branches, chaired by Sheila Roy. The objective was to make recommendations for action based upon the areas of concern and possible alternatives which had been identified. The report, Recommendations Related to Issues in the Intermediate Division was submitted on January 31, 1975.
- . The fourth stage was the preparation of the first working draft of Circular Intermediate, completed on May 15, 1975.
- . Following a meeting with the Intermediate Cyclic Review Public Advisory Committee on July 22, 1975 and further work by the writing committee, headed by Sheila Roy, the revised draft of the proposed document was completed on September 10, 1975. It is this document, General Guideline, The Intermediate Years, that has been the object of our intensive validation.

1.2 Validation Plan Outline

Two phases are involved in the overall validation of this document. The first phase, covered by this report, identifies the comments, concerns and recommendations from the field in response to the Validation Questionnaire (Appendix 2). Included in this sample are classroom teachers, principals, consultants, supervisory officers, students, teacher-educators, Ministry officials. The second phase of the plan is the institutional response from all organizations represented on the Intermediate Cyclic Review Public Advisory Committee. Included with this phase is a French translation of the questionnaire to be used to elicit responses from the Franco-Ontarian sector. Regrettably, difficulty in reaching members of the Public Advisory Committee because of the disruption in postal services resulted in delays in receiving and responding to the questionnaire. Several committee members requested time to meet with their associates - frequently from different parts of the province - which resulted in further delays. At this time, we anticipate return of raw data from the institutional response by December 15 and the completion of the report on or about December 22.

Phase One Regional Directors of Education and Superintendents of Curriculum, together with professional staff in each regional office, cooperated in soliciting responses from the field. Regional responses were solicited on the following scale:

Table 1. QUESTIONNAIRE DISTRIBUTION IN THE FIELD

<u>Region</u>	<u>M. of E. Officials*</u>	<u>Officials & Teachers of Boards**</u>	<u>Students</u>	<u>Teacher Educators</u>
NW	23	26	3	10 (Lakehead)
MN	29	42	4	5 (Laurentian)
NE	25	39	4	5 (Nipissing)
W	26	100	10	20 (10 each UWO and Windsor)
MW	22	76	8	-
N	24	89	10	20 (10 each Brock and OTEC-H)
C	43	336	35	30 (10 each Tor., York and OTEC-T)
E	22	59	6	10 (Queen's)
OV	<u>24</u>	<u>95</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u> (Ottawa)
	238	862	90	110

Total: 1300

*Includes Curriculum Services, Supervisory Services and Field Services Officers in regional offices

**Includes teachers, principals, consultants or resource teachers and supervisory officers

Regional offices collected the completed questionnaires, tabulated statistical data for each question and summarized comments for each question into supportive and non-supportive positions. Comments of a general nature were also consolidated. Regional summaries were then forwarded to the Curriculum Services Branch for an intensive summarization and analysis of each question.

1.3 Organization of the Report

Section 2 presents the summary of findings of the validation study. Section 3 summarizes the comments of respondents who expressed opinions on a wide range of issues, frequently beyond those encompassed in the questionnaire. Section 4 puts forward the conclusions and recommendations. The four appendices A through D, accompanying the report, together with appendices E through K, available in files, provide additional detail.



2. FINDINGS

Introduction

The first three questions of the Validation Questionnaire provide statistical data about the respondent and his school organization. Responses are summarized on pages 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 of this section. Each question thereafter is reproduced in italics at the top of a separate page. Questions 2.4 through 2.20 follow the same format: statistical summary, supportive comments, non-supportive comments, other comments, and recommendations, if any. Question 2.21 is a general question regarding professional development. The findings are reported in a more general format.

NUMBER QUESTIONNAIRES RETURNED	NUMBER QUESTIONNAIRES DISTRIBUTED
--------------------------------------	---

&
PERCENTAGE RESPONSE

Ret'd Dist.	TEACHER	PRINCI- PAL	CONSUL/ RES. T.	SUPERV. OFFIC.	STUDENT	TEACH- EDUCAT.	MINIST. OFFIC.	TOTALS	% RESPON
NW	4 6	8 9	0 0	5 11	3 3	9 10	23 23	52 62	83.9
MN	9 8	15 14	2 5	5 9	2 2	3 3	22 28	58 69	84.1
NE	8 8	12 14	1 1	15 17	4 4	5 5	23 25	68 74	91.9
W	15 20	29 35	4 4	29 45	16 16	9 20	18 21	120 161	74.5
MW	18 18	28 28	6 6	23 26	8 8	0 0	10 15	93 101	92.1
N	15 18	27 31	15 17	22 23	9 10	15 20	22 23	125 142	88.0
C	40 66	83 117	12 20	61 153	19 35	21 36	26 33	262 460	57.0
E	8 12	22 22	11 14	6 13	3 6	8 10	15 20	73 97	75.3
OV	10 15	20 37	8 15	18 27	5 10	7 7	7 17	75 114	65.8
TOTALS	127 171	244 307	59 82	184 324	69 94	77 111	166 205	926 1280	
% RESPON	74.3	79.5	72.0	56.8	73.4	69.4	81.0		72.3

2.2

SCHOOL AFFILIATION
OF
TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS, STUDENTS

STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF SAMPLE

TYPE OF SCHOOL		Public English	Public French	Separate English	Separate French	TOTALS
El. School K - 8	T	19	0	10	10	29
	P	64	1	29	4	98
	S	3	0	3	0	6
Sr.El. 6-8 or J.H.S. 7-9	T	43	1	3	2	49
	P	47	0	15	4	66
	S	6	0	2	2	10
High Sch. 9 or 10 to 10 or 13	T	41	1	0	1	43
	P	68	5	8	0	81
	S	47	2	16	0	65
TOTALS	T	103	2	13	3	121
	P	179	6	52	8	145
	S	56	2	21	2	81

TEACHERS T
PRINCIPALS P
STUDENTS S

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES
of
CONSULTANTS AND SUPERVISORY OFFICERS

Organizational Structure	Consultants		Supervisory Officers	
	Number	%	Number	%
K to 8, and 9 to 13	22	39.3	67	37.6
K to 6, 7 & 8, 9 to 13	24	42.9	65	36.5
K to 6, 7 to 9, 10-13	5	8.9	8	4.5
Other	5	8.9	38	21.4
Total	56		178	

This document proposes to establish a core of common learnings by listing a number of "core expectations" to be included in the program, rather than specifying certain core subjects. Do you agree with this approach?

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

- . 80% selected "yes", 16% "no"
- . 60% of the sample wrote comments; 70% of the comments were from those responding "yes"

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "CORE EXPECTATIONS"

- . learning experience in an integrated approach is more relevant than in specific subject areas
- . the vast majority favour flexibility in programming to meet individual needs, interests, attitudes and abilities

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "CORE SUBJECTS"

- . the comment occurring most often stresses the need for core subjects
- . core expectations can be met by studying core subjects; grade 7 and 8 pupils will experience less frustration and have a choice of well defined courses
- . many comments stress basic skills and concepts, with enrichment at appropriate levels for those students who can benefit

OTHER COMMENTS

- . the number of "bullets" is unrealistically high, if all are to be prescriptive
- . this is just one more phase of the Ministry abandoning its role in education today - excellent philosophical background, but that is all

RECOMMENDATIONS

- . the Intermediate Review Committee should meet with the H.S.1 Advisory Committee to discuss the question of core subjects and core expectations in the intermediate grades
- . define clearly for school boards, teachers, parents and students what is meant by core subjects and core expectations

The document specifies 12 expectations that would be part of each student's program in every year of the Intermediate Division. Are you satisfied with this approach, or do you feel it would be preferable to specify learning expectations which would have been included in each student's program by the end of the Intermediate Division?

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

- . 70% selected "prefer in each year", 24% "prefer by end of division"
- . 61% of the sample provided comments

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "EACH YEAR"

- . curriculum planning will be easier
- . will facilitate evaluation procedures
- . will facilitate co-operative planning within the division and between divisions, ensuring continuity in the program
- . provides a basis for a balanced and flexible program
- . provides consistency for curriculum planning

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "END OF DIVISION"

- . provides more flexibility for parent-student decision making
- . there is better provision for individual differences and continuity of program
- . provides more flexibility in program and curriculum planning
- . yearly expectations are not compatible with H.S.1
- . evaluation through "end of division" position will be more meaningful

OTHER COMMENTS

- . some expectations are appropriate for each year, others only by the end of the division
- . document is too general, not always consistent with H.S.1
- . expectations for math are too heavy
- . more detailed record keeping will be necessary

RECOMMENDATIONS

- . provide suggestions for bridging the gap between the elementary and secondary panels which will lead to a better continuity of program
- . resolve conflicts with H.S.1
- . develop a position paper which will include more specific details for evaluation related to expectations

2.6

RANGE OF BASIC LEARNINGS

The 12 expectations in the document are intended to outline basic learnings which should be common to every student's program. Do you feel that the range encompassed is suitable as it stands?

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

- . 77% selected "yes", 16% "no"
- . 37% listed deletions or additions

ITEMS SUGGESTED FOR DELETION

- . #11(17), #9(15), #1(11), #10(11), #12(11), #8(6), #7(8), #2(6), #4(6), #5(5), #3(3), #6(1)
- (#11(17) means expectation 11 listed 17 times by regional categories)

ITEMS SUGGESTED FOR ADDITION

- . geometry and science (13); more values education (12); Canadian history, government, economics, literature (11); self-evaluation (7); more physical education

OTHER COMMENTS

- . Expectations 7-12 should be shortened and incorporated (11)
- . like the present list (7)
- . document is a philosophical one, not a guideline

RECOMMENDATIONS

- . consolidate expectations 7 to 12
- . provide more explicit direction in values education, self-evaluation, and the subject areas: geometry, science, Canadian history, government, economics, literature, and physical education

Following each expectation are a number of statements headed by bullets. Unlike "The Formative Years" these are intended to be suggestions regarding possible content rather than prescriptive items to be included in the program.

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

- . 67% agree with approach, 26% feel the document should be more prescriptive
- . 54% of the sample provided comments

COMMENTS SUPPORTING THIS APPROACH

- . allows greater flexibility for school boards and individual schools, both in planning and in classroom instruction
- . permits a creative approach to learning and individualized instruction

COMMENTS SUPPORTING PRESCRIPTIVE STATEMENTS

- . there is a need for core content so that a uniformity of goals is maintained and assured
- . the beginning teacher is looking for more direction

OTHER COMMENTS

- . some of the expectations listed should be prescriptive and others optional
- . there are too many expectations listed; they tend to become confusing

RECOMMENDATIONS

- . since some polarity appears to exist, it is important for the Ministry to state clearly its position on whether more or less prescription is to be given, and to give good and substantial reasons for its position
- . the guidelines and/or support documents produced in conjunction with The Intermediate Years must articulate clearly those expectations that appear in the document

2.8

PERSONAL COMFORT LEVEL WITH DOCUMENT

As an educator, would you feel personally comfortable working with adolescents within the framework of this document?

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

- . 51% selected "very", 41% selected "fairly", 4% selected "not at all"

SUPPORTIVE COMMENTS

- . most supportive comments were tempered with "but's"
- . encourages and makes essential teacher self-evaluation and school-wide planning
- . combines individual needs with the reality of group instruction
- . suitable for experienced teachers

NON-SUPPORTIVE COMMENTS

- . a practical course of study motivates teachers more than a dissertation
- . expectations are not realistic enough to provide a basis for judging performance
- . students, boards and teachers are not equipped to deal successfully with the choice and decision making implied for grades 7 and 8

OTHER COMMENTS

- . specific direction, support documents, resources and in-service are needed
- . special pre-service and in-service education will be needed to implement the document

RECOMMENDATIONS

- . need firm Ministry policy, not a compromise between two opposing views
- . release support documents at same time as main document
- . provide a variety of materials on evaluation, especially related to "intangibles" (attitudes, etc.)

Do you feel that the policy proposed in the document would act as a suitable bridge between "The Formative Years" and Circular H.S.1?

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

- . 74% selected "yes", 14% said "no"
- . 51% provided comments
- . 37% of Ministry officials said "no", compared to 10% for the rest of the sample

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "YES"

- . could be a bridge if there was more clarity, more specificity, more meetings of teachers to discuss, and more personnel development
- . lists expectations clearly and keeps the focus on children
- . a great number of qualifying statements negated a great deal of the clear "yes"

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "NO"

- . many responses indicated there is nothing to bridge to, the plan is cloudy
- . let's not talk about bridges; talk about a continuum
- . K-6 program is too rigid and prescriptive; H.S.1 is too liberal and free
- . students free to "opt out" before they have experienced what they are "opting out" of

OTHER COMMENTS

- . so much will depend on PlJl implementation
- . why not start H.S.1 at Grade 11? H.S.1 and this document are in conflict for grades 9 and 10
- . should have a K-13 document instead of three separate ones

RECOMMENDATIONS

- . Ministry experts on H.S.1 and PlJl should meet with The Intermediate Years Committee to review implications for each of the three areas to help effect more of a continuum than a "bridge"
- . ensure in ongoing phases of H.S.1 and PlJl implementation that those whose judgement we seek have read the documents and appreciate the policy implications
- . after considerable refinement and simplification, validate the revised document with those who would have to translate the intent as a course of action, to determine what the organizational problems would be. Those problems may be too great to let the intent become realized.

2.10A EMPHASIS ON LITERACY AND NUMERACY IN GRADES 7, 8

In relation to your present program, do you feel this document places more or less emphasis on the basic learning skills of literacy and numeracy - in Grades 7 and 8?

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

- . 48% selected "about the same", 18% "more", 7% "less"; 27% were blank
- . only 25% provided comments

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "MORE"

- . few comments were reported, generally they perceived "better direction" than in the past

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "ABOUT THE SAME"

- . the most popular comment indicated "we are already strong in basics", good teachers stress basics

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "LESS"

- . the other demands will necessitate easing off on the basics

OTHER COMMENTS

- . educators will continue to emphasize basics

RECOMMENDATION

- . in any future validation exercise, a question on this topic area should be more specific

2.10B

EMPHASIS ON LITERACY AND NUMERACY IN GRADES 9, 10

In relation to your present program, do you feel this document places more or less emphasis on the basic learning skills of literacy and numeracy - in Grades 9 and 10?

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

- . 37% selected "about the same", 18% "more, 3% less; 42% were blank
- . only 18% provided comments

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "MORE"

- . few comments were reported; they indicated the document gives more direction and teachers will be forced to re-evaluate their programs

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "ABOUT THE SAME"

- . we have always emphasized the basics and will continue to do so

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "LESS"

- . the document is not prescriptive, the stress on social and personal growth will detract from the basics

OTHER COMMENTS

- . local courses and the individual classroom teacher determine the emphasis on basic skills
- . a number of respondents saw the document indicating mathematics and English as required courses in Grades 9 and 10

RECOMMENDATIONS

- . different people perceive the document in different ways; prescriptive, non-prescriptive; this situation must be clarified by a non-ambiguous direct statement of policy

Considering the nature of the contemporary adolescent, do you feel that the degree of optionality projected in this document is appropriate - in Grades 7 and 8?

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

- . 56% selected "about right", 24% "too much", and 3% "not enough"; 17% did not answer
- . 55% of those selecting "too much" commented, whereas only 25% of those selecting "about right" commented

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "TOO MUCH OPTIONALITY"

- . students are not ready for choice until at least Grade 9 - 25% is too much, too soon
- . they need a core - the fundamentals first
- . there are practical limitations in the elementary schools - lack of money, room, staff, and time

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "ABOUT RIGHT"

- . a good blend of "musts" and "mays"
- . students must learn to make decisions and live by them
- . optionality must also be stressed within subject areas
- . implementation for small schools is of concern

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "NOT ENOUGH"

- . subjects such as music, art, physical education, geography should be options

OTHER COMMENTS

- . can this plan be effectively administered?
- . implementation will be difficult
- . 25% won't be achieved in Grades 7 and 8 for some time

RECOMMENDATIONS

- . sections on optionality should be re-examined to clarify the terminology, to state clearly what topics are and what are not prescriptive, and to reassess the position on 25% optionality for Grades 7 and 8

Considering the nature of the contemporary adolescent, do you feel that the degree of optionality projected in this document is appropriate - in grades 9 and 10?

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

- . 50% selected "about right", 14% "too much", and 5% "not enough"; 32% did not answer
- . more than 50% of principals and teachers did not answer (perhaps elementary school staff do not want to comment on high school affairs); only 9% of supervisory officers did not answer

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "TOO MUCH OPTIONALITY"

- . students need a core of basic skills was mentioned by all categories
- . contemporary adolescent needs more controls, not fewer
- . too much choice - overwhelming, confusing

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "ABOUT RIGHT"

- . students like to be involved in planning their own programs
- . "about right" if parents and counsellors are involved
- . many mentioned a need for core and basics
- . local interpretation and implementation is still important

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "NOT ENOUGH"

- . no consensus on reasons; they included: restricting individual rights, students old enough to choose, conflicts with H.S.1

OTHER COMMENTS

- . relationship of document to H.S.1 needs clarification
- . expectations are excellent vs. expectations are incongruent
- . concern for smaller schools

RECOMMENDATIONS

- . the position of the document on core expectations should be reassessed to determine if it is realistic to expect a student to acquire "subject skills" without taking a course in the subject itself, and the subsequent effect this may have on the present freedom of choice of courses in Grades 9 and 10 as defined in H.S.1

In relation to your present program, do you find this document more or less restrictive as regards student and parental options - in Grades 7 and 8?

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

- . 33% selected "document less restrictive", 30% "about the same", 7% "more"; 31% did not reply
- . only 17% provided comments, 53% of these support the document is "less restrictive"

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "DOCUMENT MORE RESTRICTIVE"

There are only a few comments and no consensus; most are irrelevant to why the document is more restrictive to options.

- . two supporting comments are: some schools at present do not have a core program, expectations will be identified with essential subjects at the expense of options

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "ABOUT THE SAME"

Again, the comments are largely irrelevant to why the document provides "about the same" degree of optionality, many contradict the response.

- . the most frequent comment indicates there are no real options in 7 and 8 now
- . there are electives now in 7 and 8, but less than 25%
- . the shift is from cognitive to affective and personality areas

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "LESS RESTRICTIVE"

- . many more options are now available, with latitude to meet individual needs
- . change will occur, since no options are now given in 7 and 8
- . some comments showed concern for too many options too soon
- . teachers will be freer to individualize courses
- . opinion was almost equally divided as to whether "less restrictive" is a change for the better or for the worse

OTHER COMMENTS

- . many did not respond to the question, which asked for an opinion on the degree of restrictiveness of the document; most respondents gave opinions on whether or not the program should be restrictive
- . caution must be exercised in implementing too many options among youngsters in Grades 7 and 8. Their grasp of basic concepts and their readiness for more advanced studies might be jeopardized. Their emotional security might be threatened. The ability to cope with options in those grades is a greatly individual matter.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- . resources and funds should be provided to make implementation possible through additional professional development

In relation to your present program, do you find this document more or less restrictive as regards student and parental options - in Grades 9 and 10?

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

- . 38% selected "about the same", 8% "more", 10% "less"; significantly 45% did not respond (this may confirm the difficulty of responding clearly to the question)

On every summary sheet there is evidence of confusion in responding so that the number of comments found on a given sheet, e.g. 12B b) (iii) may total 15; (the 15 have perceived the document as "less restrictive"). However, only 4/15 comments support the "less restrictive" approach to curriculum.

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "DOCUMENT MORE RESTRICTIVE"

- . the document is more restrictive by demanding all expectations for each student in each year
- . more freedom under present system

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "ABOUT THE SAME"

- . completely free choice would inhibit expectations being met
- . present grades 9 and 10 programs correspond to the document

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "DOCUMENT LESS RESTRICTIVE"

- . students are provided more choices
- . greater flexibility is suggested, but not imposed

OTHER COMMENTS

- . if core subjects are replaced by a more general program based on the expectations, ensure that the program is more than "entertainment"
- . to achieve the twelve expectations, a subject program is necessary

RECOMMENDATIONS

- . clarify a policy of progressive optionality from grades 7 to 13
- . make a conscious effort to keep parents and students informed about available programs and H.S.1

Do you feel that this document can be interpreted in a way that is compatible with the present H.S.1 (or vice versa)?

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

- . 56% selected the document is "easily" compatible, 25% "with difficulty", 5% "not at all"
- . 32% provided comments, of these 47% indicated difficulty, 35% easily compatible

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "EASILY"

- . expectations, rationale, and philosophy are the same for both documents
- . document is descriptive, not prescriptive, which allows for flexibility
- . document appears to be explicit and informative

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "WITH DIFFICULTY"

- . H.S.1 focusses on credit system, this document on the expectations for all students
- . H.S.1 has more optionality, this document is more prescriptive
- . compatibility of the two documents depends on the interpreter

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "NOT AT ALL"

Only a few comments, and these lack consensus - restrictions of this document are contrary to H.S.1, problem in coordinating expectations and areas of study; H.S.1 creates a split in the Intermediate Division.

- . H.S.1 is essentially a policy statement on school organization, and this document a philosophical base for program decisions

OTHER COMMENTS

- . lack of familiarity with H.S.1 makes comparison difficult (presumably elementary staff)
- . should be a similar document for the Senior Division
- . misunderstanding of what H.S.1 is saying
- . intermediate years are split by elementary and secondary schools
- . philosophical agreement is needed before intention can be fulfilled

RECOMMENDATIONS

- . the lack of comprehension of H.S.1 apparent in this exercise suggests that further implementation of H.S.1 is needed; revision of H.S.1 needed to clarify areas of confusion and misunderstanding

2.14

PROVISION FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

Is there sufficient provision in the present statement of expectations for the exceptional child (including those with learning difficulties)?

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

- . 74% selected "yes", 18% "no"
- . 44% provided comments, with 60% of these supporting "yes"

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "YES"

- . many comments express pleasure with the document, indicating its suitability for planning programs for exceptional children (24)
- . the expectations can be adapted to the levels of exceptional children (14)
- . the document is non-prescriptive, thus non-restrictive (flexible); it allows for integration of slow learners (11)
- . a sensitive teacher with good qualifications is paramount (7)
- . must be backed by resource materials and facilities (4)

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "NO"

- . expand broad statements with specific information, or provide resource documents (11)
- . overemphasis on integration; teacher needs special training, otherwise integration is useless (10)
- . more attention is needed for developing programs for the gifted (10)

OTHER COMMENTS

- . manpower, expertise, and support materials are essential (5)
- . idealistic implementation will be the real test (3)
- . many statements about the exceptional child are inconsistent for the bright child

RECOMMENDATIONS

- . the document, with emphasis on pages 28 to 30, should be revised in an attempt to accommodate the above comments and those in the files - this should be done in consultation with the Special Education Branch

2.15

PROGRAM ELEMENTS IMPAIRED BY DOCUMENT

Are there any important elements in your present program that would be impaired by the implementation of this document?

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

- . 13% selected "yes", 68% "no", 20% did not respond

COMMENTS ON "IMPAIRED" ELEMENTS

- . our core program for grades 7 and 8 will be restricted by the condition of 25% optionality
- . some principals will use "bullets" to restrict experimentation
- . many comments favour, and many oppose, core and/or options
- . the following elements were identified as in danger of impairment: core program in 7 and 8, traditional subjects grades 7-10, present standards, generalist teacher (optionality will necessitate more rotary), freedom of choice for students and parents (grades 9, 10), opportunities to drop "weak" subjects, academically challenging subjects, time to "drill" basic skills, alternative schools, semestering, immersion programs, teacher security

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "NO IMPAIRMENT"

- . ample flexibility to fit almost any program (a frequent response)
- . no need for large-scale change

OTHER COMMENTS

- . in-service for teachers is needed
- . learning of basic subjects might be incomplete and superficial
- . if subject detail is scattered in many courses, selection of individual program will be more difficult

RECOMMENDATIONS

- . reconsider the possibility of meeting the expectations within the context of core and optional subjects, particularly at the elementary school level

2.16A FROM GENERAL PRINCIPLES TO PRACTICE IN GRADES 7, 8

Would your system find it possible to put the general principles in this document into practice in Grades 7 and 8?

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

- . 35% selected "easily", 26% "moderately difficult", 7% "very difficult"; 33% did not respond
- . 26% provided comments; 47% of these indicated moderate difficulty

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "EASILY"

- . numerous comments indicate that many expectations and "bullets" of the document are already being done
- . the document will encourage further implementation of these ideals

COMMENTS INDICATING "DIFFICULTY"

- . implementation will require major changes in school organization, particularly time-tabling; time, effort, support documents and in-service will be needed
- . the document calls for a change in attitudes; this will take time and will occur in varying degrees of success
- . the document is unrealistic as a provincial mandate
- . schools with few resources and small staff will find it virtually impossible to implement

OTHER COMMENTS

- . successful implementation will require in-service training, support documents, additional time for planning, consultative help to teachers in program planning, and specialized staff for options and electives

RECOMMENDATIONS

- . develop support materials for delivery with the document itself
- . help boards to develop in-service programs for their teachers in program planning and in curriculum building

2.16B FROM GENERAL PRINCIPLES TO PRACTICE IN GRADES 9, 10

Would your system find it possible to put the general principles in this document into practice in Grades 9 and 10?

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

- . 25% selected "easily", 19% "moderately difficult", 6% "very difficult"; 48% did not respond (this question was not applicable to many of the sample)
- . of those responding to the question, 37% gave comments

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "EASILY"

- . many principles of the document are already being implemented in many schools
- . parents and teachers will welcome the document
- . less prescriptive, thus easier to implement

COMMENTS INDICATING "DIFFICULTY"

- . subject-orientation of secondary school teachers and lack of cooperation between subject departments will inhibit implementation
- . time and effort will be needed to change the philosophical base of secondary schools, and to revise their courses and organization (particularly for general and vocational level students)
- . rotary systems make individualization difficult
- . expectations 7-12 require further explanation and will be difficult to implement

OTHER COMMENTS

- . who inspects the system and calls the shot with firmness and follow-up?
- . how will staff of Senior Division react to the document's effect on grade 9 and 10 students?

RECOMMENDATIONS

- . attitudes of secondary school teachers cannot be changed overnight; a long-term program of professional development, aimed at "spelling out" Ministry policy, development of attitudes and individualization of curriculum, should be organized - first by the Ministry, then by boards assisted by the Ministry
- . resolve the differences between H.S.1 and this document

2.17 COOPERATIVE PLANNING BY ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY STAFFS

Would the implementation of this document require cooperative planning amongst the staffs of secondary schools and those of their feeder elementary schools (public and separate)?

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

- . 88% selected "yes", 7% said "no"; only 5% did not respond
- . 58% provided comments; almost all of these supported "yes"

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "YES"

The "yes" response to this question is almost unanimous (88%); almost all the comments (87%) are in support of cooperative planning; many assume that the question is a goal or objective implicit in the document

- . the most frequent comment, by far, strongly confirms that co-operative planning is essential to successful implementation
- . dialogue is now going on, but more will be needed
- . planning should include elementary-secondary curriculum committees
- . document creates a need for cooperative planning
- . will assist students and staff in transition process, help avoid program redundancies

Many comments in this section were of the "yes - but" form; numerous obstacles were cited: distance constraints, time constraints, lack of money, personality differences, indifference of RCSS feeder schools, some elementary schools feed up to 4 high schools, lack of resource personnel

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "NO"

There are very few comments in this category; only one significant point is made:

- . if everyone lives up to his/her part of the "agreement" in each year, cooperative planning will not be necessary (even though it may be desirable)

OTHER COMMENTS

- . a challenge, doubt it can be done; easier said than done
- . inconsistencies with "The Formative Years" should be resolved
- . only by legislation can we "require" cooperative planning

RECOMMENDATIONS

- . restate the question and incorporate it into the document as an implementation objective
- . include a section in the document on how to organize co-operative planning

If adopted, what would be the best way of determining whether the 12 expectations listed in the document are part of each student's program?

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

- . 84% provided comments on this question

COMMENTS

774 people provided comments; by far, the most frequent responses are summarized in the first two comments below:

- . incorporate the expectations into all programs (course outlines, all guidelines) so that administrators, teachers, students and parents are constantly aware of them
- . use co-operative assessment (evaluation) techniques to determine the effectiveness of the programs in achieving the expectations -- involve administrators, teachers, students, and parents in the assessment
- . core and/or compulsory studies will help ensure delivery and achievement of the twelve expectations
- . develop and monitor teacher aims and objectives
- . monitor pupil programs
- . use student in self-evaluation
- . provide staff in-service
- . use standardized tests
- . use individual checklists

OTHER COMMENTS

The numerous comments with frequent reference to monitoring and accountability procedures indicate that educators at all levels are favourably disposed toward these forms of evaluation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- . the file for this question contains extensive comments; Ministry personnel responsible for developing resource materials and implementation workshops related to monitoring and accountability should review these comments carefully (Appendix E)

2.19A

PARTS OF DOCUMENT REQUIRING EXPANSION

Considering that this document is intended to be used along with the curriculum guidelines for the Intermediate Division, are there any parts of the document you feel should be expanded, in this document, for clarity?

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

- . 36% selected "yes", 43% "no", and 21% did not respond
- . 33% provided comments

COMMENTS SUPPORTING EXPANSION

- . the most frequent comment is for expansion of expectations 7 to 12; less frequently, 3, 5, and 6 are mentioned
- . expectations are good, but need expansion
- . section on the exceptional child needs more work
- . sections related to mathematics, language, knowledge of Canada, and science need expansion
- . evaluation procedures and techniques are needed

COMMENTS OPPOSING EXPANSION

- . edit the document carefully
- . teachers should be left to develop and expand any further statements of aims
- . support documents in all areas are a must

OTHER COMMENTS

- . too much philosophy, the document is much too vague
- . present Intermediate Division guidelines will need extensive revision to relate to document
- . help needed in dealing with the exceptional child
- . evaluation samples are needed and acceptable levels of achievement must be defined

RECOMMENDATIONS

- . most of the expectations and examples of how they might be achieved need to be further clarified

Considering that this document is intended to be used along with the curriculum guidelines for the Intermediate Division,

are there any topics that might require a special support document to help in successful implementation?

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

- . 49% selected "yes", 23% "no", and 28% did not respond
- . 43% provided comments

COMMENTS FAVOURING SUPPORT DOCUMENTS

- . the most frequent comment is for support documents for special education and the exceptional child (32)
- . support documents are needed for expectations 5 through 12 (30)
- . in descending order, documents are needed in values education (20), problem solving and decision-making (18), evaluation (15), english (10), mathematics (10), expectations 1 to 4 (9), guidance (8), alternative education (8), group dynamics (6), Canadian Studies (6), -- the list goes on

COMMENTS OPPOSING SUPPORT DOCUMENTS

There were only a few comments in this category, and no consensus

- . only if deemed necessary after the document is tried
- . existing intermediate guidelines need to be carefully reviewed, first
- . save money, provide people not paper -- workshops are the best implementation route

OTHER COMMENTS

- . implementation procedures are needed -- help in program development and course design
- . are teachers really ready or able to design courses from this?
- . all parts could use additional support material, but not necessarily from the Ministry

RECOMMENDATIONS

- . develop a variety of resources (updated, new, and general guidelines) to help teachers translate the document into classroom action

If you contributed opinion, individually or as part of a group, during the input phase of the Intermediate Cyclic Review, do you feel that your opinions have been respected in the present document?

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

- . 46 % selected "to great extent", 23% "to minor degree", 25% "not at all", and 6% "completely"
- . a no response was interpreted that the person had not contributed
- . of 501 who responded, 36% provided comments

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "COMPLETELY"

- . only 4 supplied comments, they were irrelevant to the response

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "TO A GREAT DEGREE"

- . the most frequent comment reflects pleasure that the input has been respected
- . document is general; can be adapted to local conditions
- . consistent with HSl and "The Formative Years"

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "TO A MINOR DEGREE"

- . document too broad and vague; should be more prescriptive and subject oriented with emphasis on basic skills
- . electives are still possible, but put some backbone in them

COMMENTS SUPPORTING "NOT AT ALL"

- . input from Moderns and Classics P.C.'s have been ignored
- . contradicts the position paper "Cyclic Review"
- . suggestion of core expectations is "playing of games" with expressed wishes of professional educators

OTHER COMMENTS

- . a good philosophical base, but will be difficult to implement
- . document should be rewritten by those in contact with reality

RECOMMENDATIONS

- . the writing committee should read the file for this question; the comments are too numerous and individualistic to summarize, yet some of the expressed concerns of individuals might be reconciled once they are known

2.21 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT NEEDS

What types of professional development do you feel would be necessary in order to implement the proposals in this document if they were accepted?

This question was formulated subsequent to the questionnaire as a result of discussion of professional development needs sensing at a Curriculum Services Coordinating Meeting. Consequently only four regions were able to obtain reaction to it (Niagara, Northeastern, Northwestern and Eastern). The first two contributed raw data from 105 respondents; the last two summarized the data but did not report the numbers. However, the results are of interest, with the following points emerging significantly:

1. Principals and supervisory officers very frequently outlined their thoughts on appropriate modes of implementation rather than on the format and content of P.D. offerings. It seemed significant that these groups saw no distinction between the two, one being inextricably bound up with the other.
2. In all categories there was a clear preference for the short workshop seminar approach, both during the school year and in the summer, as opposed to the conventional four-five week summer course and the board sponsored winter course (in total, in the ratio 42:23:18).

However, there was still substantial support for the two latter categories with many commentators advocating balanced offerings in all three categories, the vehicle to be determined by the objectives and content.

3. Although everyone who commented must have assumed that P.D. was needed, only a few (and none in the teacher group) gave the impression that an enormous amount was required. Again, although several comments spoke to the need for specialized resource expertise, this point was not made frequently enough to suggest that that was seen as a major difficulty.

The Ministry (alone and in collaboration with the boards) appeared to be the preferred purveyor of P.D. It was interesting that only once was OISE suggested. Supervisory officers stood out in feeling that the document would require modification of basic teacher education programs.

4. Although the suggestion of a "Middle Years Certificate" appeared only once, a number of respondents felt that some sort of credit (especially towards an M.Ed.) should be arranged.

5. Thirty-one topics were mentioned as areas where attention would be needed if the document were adopted. The fifteen receiving greatest support (and the frequency of reference to them in the material surveyed) are as follows. There did not appear to be significant differences among different categories of respondents:

(1)	Curriculum building	35
(2)	Evaluation of student achievement and of programs, and supervision of program (by principals and supervisory officers)	25
(3)	Psychology and cognitive development of the adolescent	24
(4)	Value and moral education	20
(5)	Cooperative planning of programs (across elementary-secondary interface)	19
(6)	Inquiry, research and problem-solving skills	15
(7)	Human relations, group dynamics, leadership and team building skills	14
(8)	Formulation of learning objectives	12
(9)	Interdisciplinary and integrative education	12
(10)	Affective and process education	11
(11)	The guideline or circular itself as course topic	8
(12)	Guidance for intermediate students	8
(13)	Classroom organization and techniques for individualization	7
(14)	Relating to parents, P.R. with parents and community, community involvement	5
(15)	Individual academic subjects (math, art, music, reading, "life skills", family studies, sexuality, out of school activities)	1 or 2 each

Recommendations

1. The general tenor of the assessment of P.D. needs does not suggest that those surveyed regard the document as "unimplementable".
2. As a Ministry, we should continue to intensify our efforts to use P.D. as an instrument for policy delivery, integrated with implementation.
3. The preference for the short seminar suggests a further "regionalization" of P.D. funds, both to the regional P.D. plans and to the regions, to support unilateral or bilateral P.D. projects closely related to implementation.
4. The distribution of P.D. funds to topics should in general reflect the ordering apparent in item 5 above.

3. FURTHER COMMENTS

The final part of the Validation Questionnaire was headed "Further Comments". Each respondent was given the opportunity to move beyond the limitations of the questionnaire and comment freely on any aspect of the Intermediate Guideline. Many of the responses were detailed and carefully prepared, indicating that considerable study and effort had gone into the research and preparation. The majority of these were constructive comments. What follows is a capsule summary of viewpoints on the various topics listed.

3.1 Twelve Expectations

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Expectations of teachers | . Common sense must prevail. If people expect the teachers to achieve everything that is written down in the brief, then the writers are asking too much. If the brief is a guideline which teachers are to strive for, then it is an excellent brief. |
| Open to interpretation | . These expectations leave too much interpretation to the principals, teachers, students and parents. Philosophically this is fantastic - in reality, a real hell of a job to try to implement. |
| Integral part of programs | . The goals and expectations described in this draft are an integral part of most programs I have taught or have observed others teaching. The value of this draft is that it articulates and formalizes these factors. |
| Meets needs of students | . It is encouraging to see an effort being made to face the realities of daily living, to develop a base for further academic success as well as to recognize the adolescent's search for identity as he/she approaches adulthood. |
| Idealistic | . This is generally good stuff but very idealistic. |
| Content oriented vs. process oriented | . The guideline statements 1-4 and 6 are "content oriented" and 5-12 "process oriented". The first group seems more easily translatable into practical classroom terms and the second group seems to have more to do with an attitude of learning, a way of teaching and a concept of the nature of society and the role of the individual in society. |

- | | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Whose priorities? | . Expectation 11 speaks of the "priorities of a concerned society" - whose priorities and who establishes them? We can say we want a literate society and reach some consensus based on current knowledge of language and translate this knowledge into textbooks and curricula, and training for teachers, etc. - can we do the same thing with values, personal aspirations, productive endeavour and social relationships? |
| Suitable for years 7 to 12 | . The expectations as outlined provide a broad and deep enough scope to occupy a reasonably talented student from Grades 7 to 12. |
| Too challenging? | . They are generally applicable to the university-bound student, but are too high for the general and opportunity-level students within many of our high schools. |
| Pressures on teachers | . It strikes me as lunacy (even sadism) to expect any human being to accomplish the goals set down here, given the pressures on classroom teachers, especially in elementary grades. |
| Too many skills for one year | . There are simply too many skills for any student to learn in <u>one</u> year. |
| Voluntary or prescriptive | . As normative expectations to be thematically interwoven in the courses teachers provide, they are useful. As prescriptive statements explicitly directing course development, they are inappropriate. |
| Overwhelming | . The accumulation of expectations tends to have a numbing effect on the reader. Although they are precisely expressed they are abstract, and unrelieved by any reference to content. |
| Policy or advice | . Please separate "policy" from "advice" in the document. Where there are bullets, the items should be policy. |
| Sequence | . With Expectation 2 there is a straying from the order of the traditional language arts. Normally they are "listening, speaking, reading, writing". |
| Sequence | . Language predates mathematics in the development of the individual and of mankind, and should come first. |
| Sequence | . Rearrange the order of expectations by placing the traditional 3R's in a location other than first, second, etc. |

Expectations
8 to 12

- . Schools are not ready for expectations 8-12. It will take a complete educational revolution rather than this one document to implement 8 to 12.

Expectations
7 to 12

- . The last six expectations for students, though worthy, should not be given as much emphasis as the first six.

3.2 Support Documents

Assistance
for teachers

- . Support documents are needed to (a) assist teachers in preparing good units of study, including samples and ideas for content, (b) help in evaluation of student achievement, (c) provide materials that will relieve some of the pressure placed on teachers by having only expectations outlined.

More detail

- . The implementation of each expectation requires a more comprehensive outline for teachers to follow.

3.3. Options

Options in
Grades 7 and 8

- . Options are inappropriate for grades 7 and 8 although there is a place for certain electives.

Copy of the
high school?

- . I wonder if we are giving way to a "copy the high school" movement among elementary schools with talk of a minimum 25% time for optional studies

3.4 Guidance Counselling

Guidance
needed

- . Students in this age group need much direct guidance and cannot, in most instance, be left to choose what they feel is right for them.

No career
orientation

- . Intermediate students should not be subjected to guidance counselling which is "career" oriented.

Each teacher
participates

- . Guidance should be a role of each teacher and not just the specialist.

Training
programs

- . Developmental guidance programs for elementary teachers are needed.



3.5 Failure

- Need to define
- . If this is a curriculum policy statement why not define what failure means rather than say it "must be re-defined"?
- Acceptable or not?
- . If "failure" is unacceptable, then why not say so and use some euphemism such as "underachievement"?

3.6 Fitness

- Education needed
- . We fail to educate people sufficiently well about fitness - we still push football not fitness.
- Life-time sports
- . Far greater emphasis should be placed on "life-time sports" and less on those of short duration.
- Insufficient time
- . How is fitness instruction possible on one activity and one swim per week?

3.7 Research

- Source?
- . What is the "significant research in Canada and abroad" that determines policy for Ontario children? Who carried it out and how valid is it?

3.8 Special Education

- Integration unrealistic
- . The integration of all exceptional students into regular programs, although commendable, seems somewhat unrealistic.
- Failure
- . More should be said in the special education section about failure, in addition to page 32 which applies to all students.
- Clarification
- . Distinguish between "handicap" and "disability".
- Bright child
- . There is no provision made for exceptional children that are extremely bright. We must have a rational policy on enrichment.
- Intellectually exceptional child
- . Surely the intellectual exceptionalities do not belong under special education. Special education is for under-achievers, for whatever reason. If the intellectually exceptional child must be lumped in with all other exceptionalities, then the opening statement (p. 28) cannot stand. No one would seek to draw the gifted child down to the regular program.



3.9 Evaluation

- Define . Evaluation requires some type of definition.
- More detail . I'd like to see this section worked to include positive statements about evaluation at the intermediate level and to delete 90% of the "musts".
- Program or student achievement . Does the policy statement refer to evaluation of the overall program or evaluation of student achievement, or both?
- Excellent . Comments on evaluation are excellent guidelines for teachers at all levels.
- No satisfactory pattern . For at least 80% of the 12 expectations, there is not a satisfactory evaluation pattern.
- Educational analysts . What we need are educational analysts who can perceive the program at the classroom level and can suggest ways to bring it back in line with the expectations.
- Better instruments . The major difficulty I have is the inadequacy of the present instruments of evaluation for the Intermediate grades.
- Evaluation techniques . An understanding of objectives and measurement and evaluation techniques is very important.
- External examinations . Only with the reintroduction of formal, external examinations will the student be able to measure himself against a recognized standard of excellence.

3.10 General

- Good compromise . I feel the document is a good compromise and should meet the demands of most educators, parents and students. It satisfies the demands of a core and allows flexibility.
- Opportunities for more students . This is the beginning of what I feel will be a very fine document. It will provide a basic core for students so that many doors to educational opportunity will remain open longer for most students.
- Back to basics . Let's forget about pie-in-the-sky aesthetics and get back to the basics. School is only one part of society and cannot accept the responsibility for producing a complete person.
- Major social problems . Perhaps I am expecting this document to solve too many of our social problems. Maybe, if in its wordiness it could at least recognize that we have major social problems about us and that we alone in education are not going to be able to solve them all.



Satisfies
students and
parents

- . This appears to be a very positive document which should meet the needs of the students and the expectations of parents. Also, it is prescriptive enough to satisfy most parents.

3.11 Compatibility with H.S.1

Problems with
semester
system

- . I feel the semester system will hamper the implementation of this document as the expectations are many and the time is short. I have discussed this with both staff members and students and I feel that as much as both would want the time to explore various areas, the semester system does not allow that full development in certain academic areas.

Need to
modify

- . Unless H.S.1 is modified, it is incompatible with the Intermediate guideline concerning the question of core. The 12 expectations are prescriptive. H.S.1 as it stands allows for evading areas of study which the student decides by choice, other than English and Canadian Studies

Secondary
school teacher

- . How does a secondary school teacher relate to this document when he/she is committed to an H.S.1 philosophy?

3.12 Local Curriculum Development

Assistance
needed

- . My major concern is that teachers be provided with ample assistance in translating the guideline into a working curriculum.

Help for
smaller boards

- . Much more needs to be done and said about local curriculum development. Smaller boards particularly do not have sufficient human and physical resources to do a first class job in this vital area.

Resistance to
local curriculum
development

- . Curriculum committees will spend untold hours putting the guideline's ideals into a more or less realistic curriculum outline for that particular subject discipline. Ironically, all over the province little elves are burning the midnight oil developing another tangent upon these philosophic ideals. From this grows another mass of materials to burden the already beleaguered teacher. How can we find time to teach?

Insufficient
time

- . Teachers simply do not have sufficient time to do the necessary work of sorting out and drawing up the detailed prescriptions in each subject area.



- Core units
- . If you are not prepared to stress core subjects in the Intermediate Division, would you be prepared to suggest core units in each subject?
- Who is ultimately responsible
- . "Implications for local curriculum" gives freedom for developing curriculum and then takes it away (must-may) and fails to determine whose is the responsibility (teacher or principal). Who is in charge of curriculum?

3.13 Students

- Self-image
- . I'm tired of hearing about the need for student's "sense of identity" and "self-image".
- Needs and goals
- . How, specifically, do the needs and goals of this age group differ from the needs and goals of other age groups?
- Humanistic approach
- . This guideline does encourage a more humanistic approach in the classroom by forcing teachers to deal with students as people.
- Problem of subject specialization
- . The increase in subject specialization which in most junior high schools and middle schools is as total as in the senior secondary school, makes it unlikely that the best intentions to deal with the pupils as individuals can survive in the ways this statement implies they ought to.

3.14 Library Resource Centres

- Effective use of resource centres
- . No specific mention is made of acquiring the ability to use library resource centres effectively yet this is the key to life-long independent learning. Surely one of the main objectives of any educational program should be to develop inquiring interested citizens who know where and how to secure resources to answer their questions.
- Resource centres and librarians
- . The document talks about such things as students developing skills of inquiry and problem solving, and of reading with enjoyment, understanding and appreciation, but no reference is made to the necessity of good library resource centres in order to achieve these and similar aims. The only reference to a librarian is in 2(d). This does not stress that this is a school librarian or teacher librarian. An occasional visit to a public library would give students "access to library personnel" but would not have the same impact as constantly available access to a school library resource centre and qualified school library personnel.



3.15 Organization Development

Skilled
trainer

- . I am personally not comfortable with staff delving into group dynamics, etc. They sometimes experiment with sensitivity training. This type of thing should be conducted by a trained expert and not by untrained teachers with the captive members of a classroom.

3.16 Format of the Report

Jargon

- . The language in the document is characterized by jargon.

Point form

- . The use of point form in print requires the deletion of all linking words. It closes off, rather than invites, participation and reaction. It is not "readable" in the way that any traditional text may be read. It is instead scanned and easily forgotten. It tends to fragment both visually and conceptually.

Condense

- . A document of 32 pages may be too long. Could some of the material be condensed using flowcharts, etc.?

Less formal
style

- . I suggest that the document be reduced in length to a few pages and that it be written in less formal style.

Reduce size

- . Reduce document from 32 pages to 6 so that most people will read it. Documents such as this should be short, clear and get to the point quickly.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Report of Findings (Section 3) includes a statistical summary indicating the percentage responses to each question. Care should be exercised in drawing conclusions solely from the statistical data. This would give a distorted picture of the findings. For each question, many of the comments favouring the supportive position took the form "yes - but", in which the respondents agreed in principle but qualified their position by identifying problem areas.

This section provides conclusions and recommendations that emerge from the total report. Along the left-hand margin are the various topics commented on. Recommendations (R) are typed in capital letters throughout.

Expectations

Teachers are overwhelmed by the many expectations and extensive lists of statements following them. The school appears to be attempting to meet all needs of adolescents and fails to recognize the existence of other external influences in society besides the school.

R.1

CONSOLIDATE THE NUMBER OF EXPECTATIONS AND STATEMENTS

Basic Core

It is inconceivable that so many items appear as core expectations. The understanding of many educators is that core denotes a relatively small nucleus of basic learnings useful or necessary for all students.

R.2

REDUCE THE NUMBER OF EXPECTATIONS TO A MORE BASIC AND ATTAINABLE CORE

Format

Teachers consider the document lengthy and complex. As such, it holds little chance of being read and studied.

R.3

REDUCE THE NUMBER OF PAGES AND SIMPLIFY THE TEXT

Implementation

The document is a radical departure from traditional practice. As such, its success is dependent upon extensive implementation plans. How does the Ministry propose to implement a guideline of such magnitude? Respondents say they lack time, resource personnel, materials, money, and organizational skills to carry out the task.

R.4

DRAW UP A PRACTICAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN THAT HAS CREDIBILITY FOR TEACHERS AND FINANCIAL BACKING BY THE MINISTRY.

<u>HS1</u>	There is lack of consistency in the policies of The Intermediate Years, The Formative Years, and HS1. The Intermediate Years and HS1 contradict one another on policy matters concerning mandatory components of a student's program. The Formative Years identifies curriculum expectations to be completed by the end of each division; The Intermediate Years lists expectations to be completed by each student in each year. Another significant difference is that in The Formative Years, the list of "learning opportunities", accompanying each "aim" is prescriptive. In "The Intermediate Years" the "statements" under each expectation are optional.
R.5	THE MINISTRY MUST RESOLVE POLICY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN HS1 AND THE INTERMEDIATE YEARS PRIOR TO COMPLETING THE FINAL REPORT. THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE INTERMEDIATE YEARS SHOULD PARALLEL THE FORMATIVE YEARS.
<u>Evaluation</u>	Respondents expressed concern as to what means of evaluation will be used to measure the effectiveness of programs in achieving expectations.
R.6	MINISTRY EXPECTATIONS WITH RESPECT TO LOCAL EVALUATION PRACTICES NEED TO BE DEFINED AND EXPANDED.
<u>Jargon</u>	There is considerable evidence of educational jargon in the document with the result that readers are confused.
R.7	REVISE USING SIMPLE, CLEAR, INTELLIGIBLE PROSE
<u>Policy</u>	Confusion was evidenced by the different interpretations of the document. In one extreme, some respondents felt all expectations and statements were prescriptive; others considered them optional.
R.8	DEVELOP AND ARTICULATE A POLICY WHICH SPELLS OUT WHAT IS COMPULSORY AND WHAT IS OPTIONAL IN SIMPLE, CLEAR, NON-AMBIGUOUS TERMS.
<u>Guidelines</u>	The document is intended to be used in conjunction with existing guidelines for the Intermediate Division. Are these guidelines up to date and compatible with the document?
R.9	ONCE THE EXPECTATIONS ARE RESOLVED, EXAMINE ALL EXISTING GUIDELINES TO DETERMINE THEIR COMPATIBILITY WITH THE DOCUMENT. UPDATE OR DEVELOP NEW GUIDELINES AS NECESSARY.
<u>Support Documents</u>	Many teachers expressed a need for selected support and resource materials in new curricular areas.

R.10 SUPPORT DOCUMENTS ARE NEEDED PARTICULARLY IN CURRICULUM AREAS CURRENTLY UNDER DEVELOPMENT, SUCH AS: EXPECTATIONS 7 TO 12, VALUES EDUCATION, PROBLEM SOLVING AND DECISION MAKING, EVALUATION, AND GROUP DYNAMICS.

Special
Education

Many of the statements in the document about exceptional children do not apply to gifted children.

R.11 REVISE THE SECTION ON SPECIAL EDUCATION TO ACCOMMODATE THE GIFTED CHILD.

Expectations
7 - 12

Inasmuch as expectations 7 to 12 refer to process rather than content and to affective and higher cognitive matters, they are less familiar to educators.

R.12 ENLARGE ON THE IDEA THAT THE FIRST 6 EXPECTATIONS ARE GENERICALLY DIFFERENT FROM THE LAST 6 AND MUST BE APPROACHED AND PLANNED FOR DIFFERENTLY.

